

Office Action. The section 102 rejection is the same as to the same claims. The current grounds of the section 103 rejections are the same as the initial grounds of rejections as to claim 5 and claims 14-20. Merely extended the initial 103 rejection of claim 5 to claims 1-13 does not create "new grounds".

Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's arguments and answer the substance of it.

MPEP 707.07(f).

This affords the Applicant the opportunity to refocus her response.

Moreover, Applicant pointed out certain advantages of the instant invention over the cited prior art.

If it is the examiner's considered opinion that the asserted advantages are not sufficient to overcome the rejection(s) of record, [the examiner] should state the reasons for his or her position in the record, preferably in the action following the assertion or argument relative to such advantages. MPEP 707.07(f).

To assure completeness fo the examiner's action and allow the applicant an opportunity to refocus her prosecution of this application, the applicant respectfully requests that the arguments and advantages asserted in the First Response be answered and addressed as required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.104.

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, applicant believes that all the claims presented in this application are allowable over the prior art, and any early allowance of the application is earnestly solicited. Formal drawings will be submitted upon notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. McKenna
Registered Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 32,368

MICHAEL R. MCKENNA
500 West Madison Street
Suite 3800
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(312) 321-0123

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 on 5/27/03.

Date: May 27, 2003 Signed: Ruth Zerkow.